

## REMARKS

The Office Action, mailed May 21, 2007, considered claims 1-25. Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crane et al. (US 6,510,236), hereinafter *Crane*. Claims 1-3, 11-13, 15-19 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martherus et al. (US 2002/0112155), hereinafter *Martherus*, in view of *Crane*. Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Crane*. Claims 5, 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Crane* as applied to claims 4-6 above, and further in view of *Martherus*. Claims 14 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martherus* and *Crane* as applied to claims 11-13 above, further in view of Hacherl (US 6,324,571).<sup>1</sup>

By this amendment claims 4, 11, 17 and 21-25 have been amended.<sup>2</sup> Claims 1-3 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 4-25 are pending, of which claims 4, 11, 17 and 21 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to controlling authentication of principals for access to network resources in a network environment. For example, claim 11 defines receiving at the super authority a request for an authenticating authority resolution from an authenticating authority that is not authorized to authenticate the principal, wherein the request comprises an account ID of a principal to be authenticated, the account ID including an individual identifier and a domain identifier. Next, claim 11 defines accessing an assignment mapping that maps each account ID in a plurality of account IDs to a corresponding plurality of authenticating authorities that are authorized to authenticate the account ID, the account ID including an individual identifier and a domain identifier, the account ID being used to identify the principal.

Next, claim 11 defines locating within the mapping an identity of an assigned authenticating authority from among the one or more authenticating authorities that corresponds to the individual identifier and domain identifier in the account ID of the principal to be authenticated. Lastly, claim 11 defines causing an authentication request to be transmitted to the assigned authenticating authority located from among the one or more authenticating authorities,

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0041] and [0043]-[0045] and in Figures 3B, 4B & 5.

the assigned authenticating authority having been located using the principal's individual identifier and domain identifiers in the principal's account ID, wherein the request asks the assigned authenticating authority to authenticate the principal.

Claim 4 is a system claim similar to claim 11. Claim 17 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to claim 11. Claim 21 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 11. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

*Crane* describes an authentication framework for authenticating clients (Abs.). Within the framework, a method is performed that involves a client sending an authentication request to an application server where the request includes a user ID and a device ID. The application server determines which device authentication server the request is for based solely on device type and forwards the request (including the device ID and the user ID) to that server (Col. 2:28-38, Col. 4:64-Col. 5:26). The application server manages authentication requests from multiple clients having various authentication devices (e.g. biometric devices such as fingerprint or iris scanners) (Col 2:1-4). Essentially, the application access server acts as a "traffic cop" or router for the various requests from the different authenticating devices based on the device paradigm, or the data originating from the authenticating device (Col. 3:14-24, 37-46).

*Martherus* describes authenticating a user for multiple resources distributed across multiple domains using a single authentication (Abs.). The described method receives a request for a protected resource in a first domain. The system then redirects the request to a second domain for authentication. The user is authenticated for the first domain at the second domain (par. [0012]). The second domain transmits an authentication cookie to the user that allows the user to authenticate to a third domain. Then, when the user requests authentication to the third domain, the system uses the cookie from the second domain to authenticate to the third domain (par. [0011]-[0012]).

Neither *Crane* nor *Martherus* teaches or suggests receiving at the super authority a request for an authenticating authority resolution from an authenticating authority that is not authorized to authenticate the principal, wherein the request comprises an account ID of a principal to be authenticated, the account ID including an individual identifier and a domain identifier, as recited in claim 11. Furthermore, neither *Crane* nor *Martherus* teaches or suggests

accessing an assignment mapping that maps each account ID in a plurality of account IDs to a corresponding plurality of authenticating authorities that are authorized to authenticate the account ID, the account ID including an individual identifier and a domain identifier, the account ID being used to identify the principal, as recited in claim 11. At least for either of these reasons, claim 11 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 4, 17 and 21 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 4, 11, 17 and 21, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

Claims 1-3 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-3 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot. Claim 17 has been amended to recite "an apparatus for" instead of "a method for." Thus, the "means for" claim limitations now correspond to the apparatus claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 1-3 and 17-20 be withdrawn.

Claims 4-10 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. For purposes of prosecution efficiency, claims 4 and 21-25 have been amended to recite "physical, recordable-type computer-readable media." Thus, with respect to claims 4-10 and 21-25, Applicants do not intend for claims 4-10 and 21-25 to include signals and do not intend for claims 4-10 and 21-25 to be drawn to a form of energy. Accordingly, with respect to claims 4-10 and 21-25, and only claims 4-10 and 21-25, "physical, recordable-type computer-readable media" is defined so as to exclude "signals."<sup>3</sup> Applicants submit that this amendment overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection with respect to claims 4-10 and 21-25. Accordingly,

---

<sup>3</sup> However, Applicants do not necessarily generally concede that a "signal" is non-statutory subject matter. A signal has physical properties that can be physically manipulated to temporarily store data in a meaningful format, such as, for example, as the data is transferred between computer systems. Further, as indicated in the Office Action, embodiments of the invention utilizing signals as computer-readable media are expressly described in the specification. Thus, Applicants intend that the language of claims 4-10 and 21-25 excludes "signals" from the meaning of "one or more physical storage media" only as applied to claims 4-10 and 21-25. However, the amendments to claims 4 and 21 are not intended as a general exclusion of embodiments of the invention that utilize "signals" as a form or type of computer-readable media. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to file additional claims reciting "computer-readable media" that include "signals" if deemed appropriate.

Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 4-10, and 21-25 be withdrawn

Claims 17-20 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. Claims 17-20 have been amended to recite "an apparatus for" instead of "a method for." Thus, the "means for" claim limitations now correspond to an apparatus claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 17-20 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 4-10 were objected to due to grammatical and other informalities. Claims 1-3 have been cancelled, thus rendering any objections to claims 1-3 moot. Claim 4 was objected to for a grammatical informality. The grammatical informality of claim 4 has been amended from "there one" to "thereon." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1-3 and 4-10 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
MICHAEL B. DODD  
Registration No. 46,437  
GREGORY R. LUNT  
Registration No. 47,354  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973

RDN:MBD:crb  
CRB0000005730V001